

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named  
Inventor : Siong Lee Lim et al.

Group Art Unit: 1723

Examiner: M. Pham

Appln. No. : 10/696,879

Filed : October 30, 2003

For : MOUNTING CONFIGURATION FOR A  
FILTRATION CANISTER

Docket No. : S104.12-0050/STL 11408.00

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
MAR 24 2006

## CERTIFICATION OF TELEFACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

(571) 273-8300

Sir:

I certify that the following papers are being telefacsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below:

1. Response After Final.

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN &amp; KELLY, P.A.

Date: March 24, 2006By: 

Leanne R. Taveggia, Reg. No. 53,675  
Suite 1400 - International Centre  
900 Second Avenue South  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3244  
Phone:(612)334-3222 Fax:(612)334-3312

LRT/jme

6 PAGES - INCLUDING COVER PAGE

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
MAR 24 2006

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE  
EXAMINING GROUP 1700

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named  
Inventor : Siong Lee Lim et al.

Group Art Unit: 1724

Appln. No. : 10/696,879

Examiner: M. Pham

Filed : October 30, 2003

For : MOUNTING CONFIGURATION FOR A  
FILTRATION CANISTER

Docket No. : S104.12-0050/STL 11408.00

**RESPONSE AFTER FINAL**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

(571) 273-8300

Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on January 25, 2006. In the Office Action, claims 1-10 and 12-22 were pending and were rejected. With this response, all claims are unchanged. For the reasons discussed below, it is respectfully believed that claims 1-10 and 12-22 are in condition for allowance.

On page two of the Office Action, claims 1-10 and 12-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Graeve (U.S. Patent No. 6,475,270). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art reference must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. In *re Vaeck*, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991); M.P.E.P. §2143. Applicant respectfully submits that the evidence of record in the latest Office Actions are insufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In particular, it is respectfully submitted that the Graeve reference simply does not teach or suggest all of the elements recited in independent claims 1, 12 and 22.